



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/905,971	08/05/1997	KAZUYUKI TOYODA	2342-0111P	6177

2292 7590 07/01/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, RUDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/905,971

Applicant(s)

TOYODA ET AL.

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 26.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-4, 7-16, 20-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateishi et al (U.S. Pat. 4,405,435) in view of Mikio Takagi (Pub. No. 2-152251; IDS Paper 6 Document). Tateishi et al describe a substrate processing apparatus (Figure 4) where component chambers are each hermetically configured (column 1, lines 35-45) and exhibit the following attributes:
 - i. a substrate transfer section embodied by Tateishi et al here as item 52 or 53, Figure 4 (column 5, lines 40-55)
 - ii. a module (items 52-54, Figure 4; column 5, lines 40-55) embodied here by Tateishi et al as processing chambers for processing substrates as first and second intermediate processing or treatment chambers (items 52-55 Figure 4; column 5, lines 40-55) for processing substrates (3).
 - iii. first substrate transfer means embodied by Tateishi et al as item 62 of Figure 4 (column 5, lines 55-68) provided inside
 - iv. a substrate transfer section (items 52 or 53, Figure 4) capable of transferring a substrate within the module
 - v. a first valve (items 64, Figure 4; 71, Figure 6) capable of establishing hermetic (column 2, lines 43-63) isolation between the processing chambers for processing substrates

Art Unit: 1763

- (items 3, all Figures; column 1, lines 45-50) and a plurality of chambers embodied by Tateishi et al as first and second intermediate processing or treatment chambers (items 52-55 Figure 4; column 5, lines 40-55) when the first valve is closed and allowing a substrate to pass through when opened
- vi. a second valve (item 71, figure 4) capable of establishing hermetic (column 2, lines 43-63) isolation between the first and second intermediate processing or treatment chambers (items 52-55 Figure 4; column 5, lines 40-55) and a substrate transfer section embodied by Tateishi et al here as item 52, Figure 4 (column 5, line 53) when the second valve is closed and allowing a substrate to pass through when opened
 - vii. a third valve (item 77, figure 4) capable of establishing hermetic (column 2, lines 43-63) isolation between the first and second intermediate processing or treatment chambers (items 52-55 Figure 4; column 5, lines 40-55) and a substrate transfer section embodied by Tateishi et al here as item 52, Figure 4 (column 5, line 53) when the third valve is closed and allowing a substrate to pass through when opened
 - viii. first and second intermediate processing or treatment chambers additionally are provided with second substrate transfer means (item 67, Figure 4; column 6, lines 16-30) capable of transferring a substrate to a processing or treatment chamber.
 - ix. all component chambers are each hermetically configured (column 2, lines 43-63) and can be independently reduced in pressure (items 69, 76, 112, 8, Figure 6, column 6, line 33 - 45). Motivation for such design is additionally provided (column 6, line 33 - 45).

Art Unit: 1763

- x. an intermediate chamber (item 52 or 53, Figure 4) supporting substrate holding means (items 65 or 72, Figure 4) positioned closer to the substrate transfer section (items 52, Figure 4) than the second substrate transfer means (item 78, Figure 4)
- xi. Tateishi et al describe cassette holding means accommodating a plurality of substrates (Items 63,68,75; column 5, lines 55-65) where the first substrate transfer means is capable of transferring a substrate between the cassette and plurality of chambers.
- xii. Tateishi et al describe a first substrate transfer means structure capable of transferring a wafer cassette (item 67, Figure 4; column 6, lines 16-30).
- xiii. Tateishi et al specifically describe a cassette introduction section whose height is different from the height of the cassette holding means (all Figures). Tateishi et al describe processing a plurality of substrates simultaneously
- xiv. Tateishi et al specifically describes transferring and processing a single wafer at a time (Figure 7; column 17, lines 14-21)

Tateishi et al do not expressly describe modules piled up separately in a substantially vertical direction. Tateishi et al do not expressly describe varying the number (one or more) of transferred and/or processed substrates.

Mikio Takagi describes a manufacturing system of vertical-type semiconductor (title, JPO abstract). Specifically, Mikio Takagi describes "...a process chamber installed in each stage position of a space positioned in an up-and-down direction..." in order to "...reduce a floor area and to easily install more systems...". Thus the Mikio Takagi reference supports a

Art Unit: 1763

substrate processing apparatus hermetically configured exhibiting modules piled up separately in a substantially vertical direction. Mikio Takagi additionally describes all component chambers each hermetically configured and can be independently reduced in pressure (abstract, "Individual process chambers are evacuated in advance to a prescribed pressure by using individual pumps 3"). Mikio Takagi additionally provides for an elevator capable of vertically moving a first substrate transfer means (items 11, 14; constitution). Mikio Takagi additionally provides for an elevator capable of vertically moving a first substrate transfer means (items 11, 14; constitution). Component chambers are each hermetically configured (certified STIC translation, page 5, second paragraph) and exhibit the following attributes:

- xv. a substrate transfer section embodied by Mikio Takagi here as item 14, Figure 1, (certified STIC translation, page 12, 3rd paragraph)
- xvi. a plurality of directly detachably (first paragraph, page 11) attached modules (items 14/2/3, Figure 1; certified STIC translation, pages 10-12) and a plurality of modules embodied by Mikio Takagi as processing or treatment chambers (items 2, Figure 1; certified STIC translation, pages 10-12) for processing substrates - The modules are capable of being attached to and detached from the substrate transfer section (page 11, 1st paragraph)
- xvii. common first substrate transfer means embodied by Mikio Takagi as item 14 of Figure 1 (certified STIC translation, pages 10-12) provided in

Art Unit: 1763

- xviii. a substrate transfer section (item 14, Figure 1) capable of transferring a substrate to the plurality of modules
- xix. a first valve (items 12, figure 1) capable of establishing hermetic (certified STIC translation, page 5, second paragraph) isolation between the processing chambers for processing substrates and a plurality of modules where the first valve is closed and allowing a substrate to pass through when opened (certified STIC translation, page 12, last paragraph)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Tateishi et al substrate processing apparatus by implementing the Mikio Takagi substrate processing apparatus hermetically configured exhibiting modules piled up separately in a substantially vertical direction.

Motivation for such design alteration of the Tateishi et al substrate processing apparatus is provided by Mikio Takagi. Specifically, "To reduce a floor area and to easily install more systems (...modules being detachable attached...)" which is centered on reducing the clean room foot print in order to reduce operating costs ("Purpose" of IDS document abstract.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the number (one or more) of transferred and/or processed substrates.

Art Unit: 1763

Motivation for varying the number (one or more) of transferred and/or processed substrates is drawn from larger manufacturing throughput of the claimed apparatus.

1. Claims 5, 6, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateishi et al (U.S. Pat. 4,405,435) as applied to claims 1-4, 7-16, 20-36 above, and further in view of Hideki Lee (U.S. Pat. 5,616,208). Tateishi et al do not describe processing substrates under atmospheric pressure through a substrate transfer section. Hideki Lee describes a vacuum processing apparatus including a plurality of vacuum processing chambers (column 9, lines 19-34). Specifically, Hideki Lee describes processing substrates serially and under atmospheric pressure (column 10, lines 32-42) through a substrate transfer section (items 20, 21, Figure 8). Additionally, Hideki Lee (column 5, lines 1-14), describes processing substrates in a substrate processing chamber (items 1, 2, and 3, Figure 8) under reduced pressure (column 9, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Tateishi et al multichamber processing apparatus whereby substrates are transferred through a substrate transfer section (items 20, 21, Figure 8) while sustaining atmospheric pressure as is taught by Hideki Lee.

Motivation for processing substrates that are transferred through a substrate transfer section (items 20, 21, Figure 8) while sustaining atmospheric pressure during the transfer is centered on

Art Unit: 1763

selecting where, in the processing of the substrate, the reactant gas will be introduced. Such selection is within the independent pressure control as exhibited by the references and encompassed within the level of ordinary skill in view of the cited references.

2. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateishi et al (U.S. Pat. 5,186,718) as applied to claims 1-4, 7-16, 20-36 above, and further in view of Shunpei Yamazaki (U.S. Pat. 4,582,720). Tateishi et al describe an intermediate chamber (item 24, Figure 1) supporting substrate holding means (item 40, Figure 1) positioned closer to the substrate transfer section (items 21, Figure 1) than the second substrate transfer means (item 42, Figure 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b). However, Tateishi et al does not specifically describe an intermediate chamber supporting heat-resistant substrate holding means positioned closer to the substrate transfer section than the second substrate transfer means. Because the Tateishi et al apparatus plasma processes the substrate in later chambers (items 34, Figure 1), this may imply that there is no heat resistance imparted to the intermediate chamber substrate holding means. The structural characteristics of Shunpei Yamazaki's plasma assisted chemical vapor deposition apparatus (column 2, lines 13-21) is in many respects identical to the presently claimed apparatus. The primary difference between the presently claimed invention at that of Shunpei Yamazaki's plasma assisted chemical vapor deposition apparatus is the orientation of the device itself. The presently claimed invention has its long axis (processing direction vector) parallel to the gravity vector while the long axis (processing direction vector) of the Shunpei Yamazaki apparatus is perpendicular to the gravity vector. Specifically, Shunpei Yamazaki describes a substrate transfer section (item A, Figure 1), an intermediate chamber (item B, Figure 1), and a final processing chamber (item C, Figure 1). An intermediate chamber (item B, Figure 1), supports heat-resistant substrate holding means (item 70, Figure 1) used in the intermediate processing chamber under a heated plasma process (column 5, lines 17-25; lines 55-59).

Art Unit: 1763

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enhance the Tateishi et al intermediate chamber (item 24, Figure 1) supporting substrate holding means (item 40, Figure 1) positioned closer to the substrate transfer section (items 21, Figure 1) than the second substrate transfer means (item 42, Figure 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b) by employing heat-resistance as taught by Shunpei Yamazaki's plasma assisted chemical vapor deposition apparatus.

Motivation for employing heat resistance to the substrate holding means (item 40, Figure 1) is drawn from the fact that plasma generating apparatus commonly operate at elevated temperatures.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed February 27, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant states that:

“

...the combination of Tateishi and Takagi at least fails to teach or suggest a common first substrate transfer device, provided in the first substrate transfer section, for transferring substrates into the plurality of modules, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 14.

“

as amended herewith.

Art Unit: 1763

The Examiner disagrees. As stated in prior actions, Tateishi expressly teaches a common first substrate transfer device (62, Figure 4; column 5, lines 55-68) provided in the first substrate transfer section (items 52 or 53, Figure 4), for transferring substrates (3) into a module (Figure 2). Tateishi was further discussed as teaching that Tateishi's module (Figure 2) has first (64) and second (71) valves and an intermediate chamber (item 52 or 53; Figure 4).

Applicant states that the Examiner's position is that "...the Office Action asserts that the claimed plurality of modules is disclosed as items 52-55 in Fig. 4 of Tateishi. (see Office Action, sections i. And ii., page 2)". In fact, the Examiner's position in the non-final Office Action, paper 23 mailed 8/27/2 at sections i. and ii., page 2 states:

“

- i. a substrate transfer section embodied by Tateishi et al here as item 52 or 53, Figure 4 (column 5, lines 40-55)
- ii. a module (items 52-54, Figure 4,3; column 5, lines 40-55)...

“

As such the Examiner did not convey Applicant's interpretation that Tateishi teaches "plurality of modules is disclosed as items 52-55 in Fig. 4". The Examiner specifically, iterated and underlined, a single module, not modules, as items 52-54, Figure 4,3 of Tateishi. Consistent with Applicant's misinterpretation of the Examiner's Office Action, Applicant believes the Examiner is assigning "multiple labels to the same item". As set forth in the prior office action, Tateishi's collected items 52-54 make up "one module" with component parts 52, 53 as substrate transfer sections and component part 54 as a processing/treatment chamber. Tateishi further teaches a

Art Unit: 1763

common first substrate transfer device (62) provided in the transfer section for transferring the substrates (3) into the one module.

Applicant states that:

“

...the Office Action has failed to show where Tateishi discloses each module comprising a processing chamber, and an intermediate chamber provided between the processing chamber and the transfer section, as set forth in claim 1. In addition, the Office Action has failed to show where Tateishi discloses each module comprising a processing chamber and a first and second intermediate chambers provided between the processing chamber and the transfer section, as set forth in claim 14.

“ (page 7, second paragraph of response)

The Examiner has maintained that Tateishi teaches one module (Figure 4) comprising a processing chamber (54), and an intermediate chamber (53) provided between the processing chamber and the transfer section (52 or section area where 62 is located), as set forth in claim 1. In addition, Tateishi discloses the module (Figure 4) comprising a processing chamber (54) and a first (52) and second (53) intermediate chambers provided between the processing chamber and the transfer section (52 or section area where 62 is located), as set forth in claim 14.

Applicant's position that Tateishi fails to teach or suggest modules piled up in a substantially vertical direction such that the plurality of modules are capable of being attached to and detached from a wall of the transfer section is agreed by the Examiner as Applicant identifies (second paragraph, page 8). However, the Examiner believes Takagi teaches Tateishi's deficiency. Specifically, Takagi teaches modules (each of the three items 2,3; Figure 1) piled up in a

Art Unit: 1763

substantially vertical direction such that the plurality of modules (three in Figure 1) are capable of being attached to and detached from a wall of the transfer section as taught by Takagi (PTO Translation of Takagi; Page 11, First paragraph – “Three pairs of process chambers (2) and pumps (3) are shown in the example of Figure 1, but their numbers can be adventitiously selected in consideration of the number of required processes.”)

Applicant states that Takagi does not teach an elevator capable of vertically moving a first substrate transfer means because each of Takagi's modules has its own transfer means 14. Applicant believes that Takagi's page 8, lines 9-11 supports this position. The Examiner believes Takagi does teach an elevator (mechanism 11 Figure 1,2; Page 12, second paragraph) capable of vertically moving a first substrate transfer means (items 11, 14; constitution, as stated in the original rejection) because each of Takagi's modules has its own transfer means 14 that operates with Takagi's cassette elevator for “transporting a wafer cassette to the position of each chamber.” as discussed by Takagi (page 12, 2nd, 3rd paragraph).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 1763

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (703) 305-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official after final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9311. The official before final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9310. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (703) 308-0661. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills, at (703) 308-1633.



JEFFRIE R. LUND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

~~Rudy Zervigon - RZ~~

June 30, 2003